

City of Carlsbad

PROPOSITION C – OPEN SPACE & TRAILS

AD HOC CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

CHARTED NOTES – April 28, 2006

End Products the Committee Expects to Produce:

- One list of properties eligible for consideration
- Citywide in scope
- Prioritized
- Explicit rationale for priority order

Committee Work Plan

1. Seek Council guidance on the scope of “open space” members intended the Committee consider.
2. Establish eligibility criteria
3. Establish ranking (prioritization) criteria
4. Report to Council Members (and seek guidance from them) regarding the Committee’s proposed eligibility and prioritization criteria, its planned procedure for identifying and processing candidate properties, as well a suggested timeframe for that process. (The Committee expects candidate properties to be identified through a combination of public recommendations and Committee- requested research by City staff.)
6. Given Council’s response, either implement or revise the process.

Suggestions from Members of the Public

- Refer to definitions, classifications and criteria identified in the 1992 OSCMP – staff to provide members with copies
- Committee should propose a reasonable amount of money to spent in total
- Include extensive public information/outreach in the process
- Solicit input from other agencies and cities that have already completed similar efforts
- Have staff compile a list of properties for consideration

Follow-up Steps

- Chairman and staff to seek Council guidance on scope of “open space” definition
- Staff to provide Committee Members with the document referenced by Mr. Gary Hill, annotated for ease of reference
- Committee to plan public outreach effort to enhance front-end input for the Committee’s consideration in establishing the process architecture for identification and prioritization processes
- Staff to arrange for site visits
- Staff to research other models for open space acquisition
- Staff to provide an updated and refined map of that presented in the HMP

Potential Eligibility Criteria to Consider

- ✓ Mitigation land potential
- ✓ Biologic value
- ✓ Cultural value
- ✓ Expands existing trails and/or creates new ones
- ✓ Availability – not obviously unavailable
- ✓ Within the City limits and/or contiguous therewith
- ✓ Watershed value
- ✓ Not already in “the pipeline” (via development agreements?)

“*Bang-for-the-buck*” value (potential for leveraging to gain multiplier effects) parked for reference when addressing criteria for establishing relative priorities.

Charted Notes approved by the Committee at their regularly scheduled meeting of June 2, 2006.